

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Economics, Management and Trade
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEMT_105364
Title of the Manuscript:	The Influence of Beauty Influencers in Recommending Halal Cosmetics: Examining Their Impact on Engagement, Expected Value, and Purchase Intention
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journaljemt.com/index.php/JEMT/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The study is deemed appropriate 2. The Relevance of Beauty Influencers in Recommending Halal Cosmetics: Examining Their Impact on Engagement, Expected Value, and Purchase Intention 3. The Roman numbers in the abstract should be removed 4. These should be numbered appropriately The study implications and Research Limitations and Suggestions 5. The suggestions and other corrections will enhance it for scientific publication 6. The references are current and appropriate <p>Fig .1. , should be corrected</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>The study has to work on language usage and spelling, eg Hipotesis should be hypothesis</p> <p>Kumar & NayaK [11] should Kumar and Nayak [11], this should apply to Kim & Han [21] and look through your work for such errors.</p> <p>The values in the tables are numbers and not currency so, 0,506 should be 0.506 and this should apply to all numbers</p> <p>The study has to properly present the reliability considering best practices, from the current presentation it is difficult to make meaning out of the data on the reliability.</p> <p>The conclusion should be presented in a paragraph and not bulleted</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Afful Ekow Kelly
Department, University & Country	Catholic University of Ghana, Ghana